



#8/a
max
3/16/04

01263.001793.

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
: Examiner: A.W. Carter
ALEXANDER RALPH LYONS ET AL.)
: Group Art Unit: 2625
Application No.: 09/718,405)
: Filed: November 24, 2000)
: For: IMAGE PROCESSING)
: APPARATUS)
: March 5, 2004

RECEIVED

MAR 12 2004

Technology Center 2600

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT
AND AMENDMENT

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated February 5, 2004, Applicants elect,
with traverse, initially to prosecute Group I (Claims 1-34), drawn to 3-D imaging analysis,
and newly added Claims 66-70, which relate to the same invention, classified in class 382,
subclass 154.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

March 5, 2004
(Date of Deposit)

LEONARD P. DIANA (Reg. No. 29,296)
(Name of Attorney for Applicant)

Leonard P. Diana
Signature

March 5, 2004
Date of Signature

03/11/2004 WABDELRI 00000043 09718405

01 FC:1201 258.00 OP
02 FC:1202 90.00 OP

In traversal of the restriction requirement, Applicants note that the only ground for restriction is that Invention II allegedly has a separate utility of defining matching features in images within a sequence of images. Applicants submit that a careful reading of independent Claims 1, 17, 31, 32, 33, and 34 of Invention I, and independent Claims 35, 48, 49, 58, and 61-64 of Invention II will reveal that both Invention I and Invention II relate to the calculation of camera projections for images.

Referring to Claim 35 of Invention II, by way of example, it is clear that the utility of what is recited in this claim is to determine a respective camera projection for each of at least some of the images defining the projection points on the object surface into the image. The method of Claim 35 uses "data defining matching features in images within a sequence of images" as an input to the process of determining a respective camera projection. Applicants assert there is no processing performed in Claim 35 to actually define matching features in the images. It is merely that the data defining matching features in images within a sequence of images is the starting point for the method of determining a respective camera projection for each of at least some of the images defining the projection points on the object surface into the image.

Similarly, the recited purpose of Claim 1 of Invention I is to generate data defining estimates of camera projections.

As such, both Invention I and Invention II relate to the calculation of camera projections for images.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of all of Claims 1-70 in the present invention.

Also, please amend the above-identified application as follows.

Amendments to the claims are reflected in the listing beginning at page 4, and the Remarks begin at page 33.